

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the patent application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-15 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated Gibbs. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that the claims, as amended, are patentable over the Gibbs patent.

The present invention teaches and claims a self-authenticating signature device, such as a chipcard, which includes a signature program and additional signature certificate information for providing an expanded electronic signature. The signature device and method do not require communication with an external authenticating entity when the user is attempting to digitally sign a document. The claims, as amended, more clearly recite that the signature device has the program and additional information stored together so that it can perform self-authenticating digital signing.

In contrast, the cited Gibb patent is directed to a server-based electronic signature system and method, whereby a server maintains the randomly-generated keys used to generate digital signatures (see: Col. 3, lines 50-52), counters for tracking how many signatures have been



generated by a particular key (see: Col. 3, lines 55-58), and the process, or user interface, for performing signature authentication (Col. 3, lines 16-30). As explicitly taught by Gibbs, an "adapted digital signature" includes signature along with information for contacting authenticating server, specifically the service id and domain name (Col. 3, lines 16-30). When a user seeks to sign a document electronically, the user enters the "adapted digital signature" having signature component 132 and then a server process is contacted for authentication. Gibbs does not teach that the signature component has any additional information provided therewith. Moreover, Gibbs does not provide a signature device or method whereby the device includes both the signature program and all necessary information for creating and authenticating a digital signature. Rather, Gibbs provides a server-based signature authentication system and method. As such, Applicants believe that the Gibb patent neither anticipates obviates the invention as claimed.

It is well established under U. S. Patent Law that, for a reference to anticipate claim language under 35 USC 102, that reference must teach each and every claim feature. Since the Gibbs patent does not teach the signature device



and method as claimed, it cannot be maintained that the Gibbs patent anticipates the invention.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the amended claim language in light of the remarks, withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

E. Hamann, et al

Registration No. 30,374 Tel. (914) 962-5910